

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HISTORIC CONSERVATION BOARD

MONDAY, October 7, 2002

3:00 P.M., J. MARTIN GRIESEL ROOM, CENTENNIAL PLAZA II

The Historic Conservation Board met at 3:00 P.M., in the J. Martin Griesel Room, Centennial Plaza II, with members Borys, Clement, Raser, Senhauser, Spraul-Schmidt, Sullebarger, and Wallace present. Absent: Bloomfield and Kreider

MINUTES

The minutes of the Monday, September 23, 2002 meeting were approved (motion by Spraul-Schmidt, second by Borys).

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 1105 ELM STREET, OVER-THE-RHINE (SOUTH) HISTORIC DISTRICT

Urban Conservator William Forwood presented the staff report on this request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove ten original deteriorated wood windows and install 1/1 aluminum sash windows on the YMCA building located at 1105 Elm Street. The YMCA building is a contributing building within the Over-the-Rhine (South) Historic District.

Mr. Forwood explained that this has been an ongoing project where the owner has replaced windows as they are deteriorated and as he has the money. His intent at this time is to replace ten windows in the most deteriorated condition. Mr. Forwood pointed out that some windows on the upper floors have already been replaced with aluminum windows with a coil stock over the wood trim. In addition, there have been inappropriate window replacements on the bottom two floors.

Mr. Forwood stated staff is suggesting a standard be set for future windows on this building by recommending that the owner be permitted to replace deteriorated windows with aluminum windows with the appearance of wood, but without the metal panning. This condition is shown in one photograph included in the staff report that shows a window where this panning has partially fallen away to reveal the original wood trim. Further, staff recommended that the panning already in place be removed.

[Ms. Sullebarger joined the meeting.]

Applicant Bob McAndrews was present to respond to questions from the Board. Mr. McAndrews stated that the owner wishes to cover the wood trim due to its deteriorated condition. He suggested, in an effort to save the jambs and surrounding wood trim, that he be allowed to install the metal panning providing it be made to match the existing trim.

[Mr. Raser joined the meeting.]

Mr. McAndrews confirmed for Ms. Borys that the plane of the replacement glass was in the same plane as the original glass. In response to Ms. Sullebarger, he acknowledged he could bend the panning to better match the profile of the surrounding wood trim. Ms. Borys added that she would like the final panning design be reviewed by the Urban Conservator including where the edge of the panning meets with the brick.

BOARD ACTION

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Clement, second by Spraul-Schmidt) to take the following actions:

1. Find that the existing replacement windows (with aluminum panning) are inappropriate as installed in scattered locations throughout the building.
2. Approve 1/1-double-hung aluminum windows to fit the original openings without the additional panning or with aluminum panning with a profile and placement to match the existing wood trim.
3. Stipulate that all window replacement installations on all elevations of the building be reviewed by the Urban Conservator for Certificates of Appropriateness.
4. Recommend that the aluminum panning on the existing replacement windows at 1105 Elm Street either be removed or replaced with aluminum panning with a profile and placement to match the existing wood trim.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS & SECTION 106 REVIEW, 1214 VINE STREET, OVER-THE-RHINE (SOUTH) HISTORIC DISTRICT

Urban Conservator Forwood presented the staff report for a Certificate of Appropriateness and Determination of Effect for a Section 106 Review for the rehabilitation of the building at 1214-16 Vine Street. The building, which is located in the Over-the-Rhine (South) Historic District, is being rehabbed for the creation of 17 market-rate housing units. The proposed project will ultimately be submitted for review to the Ohio Historic Preservation Office for certification under the Federal Historic Tax Credit program.

Mr. Forwood explained that the project is being phased to accommodate two different funding sources. The first phase, being presented at this time, is for the rehabilitation of the front and south elevations, which is being funded by the City's Vine Street Façade Program. Because the Façade Program is federally funded, a 106 Review is required. Additional funding has been applied for through the City's Housing Round program, which is still under review and has not yet been approved. This second phase will include additional changes to the remaining elevations and the interior.

Mr. Forwood stated that the drawings of the storefront show it is being replaced compatibly, but at issue are the proposed changes for the south elevation. The applicants are proposing to cut thirteen new window openings in addition to the existing eleven openings. Mr. Forwood said that although district guidelines suggest that new window cuts might constitute as much as 50% of a wall surface, a party wall elevation should still read as a mass and should not create a new, competing façade. He indicated that given recent decisions regarding Tax Act certification, it is likely that OHPO reviewers would ask that the openings be reduced to better preserve the mass of the wall. Mr. Forwood explained that staff accepts the new window cuts as desirable and even necessary to the project, but suggested that the applicants reduce the number and size of the windows to make it more acceptable for both district guidelines and Tax Act standards. He suggested that a compromise could be reached by changing the double doors to single ones or by raising the sill height.

Mr. Forwood clarified that as proposed, the openings are the height of a full door and hinge inward. The drawings depict flush-mounted, three-foot high railings at the openings. Responding to Mr. Raser, Mr. Forwood confirmed that the new window cuts are on the property line, so a light and air easement would be required. Mr. Forwood said that he understood the owner of the adjacent parking lot has agreed to such an easement.

Mr. Forwood explained that a Certificate of Appropriateness is based on the historic district guidelines; however, a determination of No Adverse Effect is based on conformance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. If the Board determines that the proposed wall treatment does not meet the Standards, the issue will have to be resolved at the State level.

Mr. Senhauser voiced concern that the project is being reviewed in phases. He acknowledged that the project would not work well without the new window cuts. However, if the Board allows the window cuts and approves a Certificate of Appropriateness as well as makes a determination that there is No Adverse Effect, they could not be assured that the project would go forward.

Architect Mark Gunther and developer Bill Baum were present to respond to questions from the Board. Mr. Gunther replied to Ms. Sullebarger that according to his conversations with the State, an acceptable ratio of windows to masonry wall is 45%. Mr. Gunther reiterated that with the Façade Program funds, Housing Round funds, and the tax act credit, there would be three separate reviews. He added that all of these resources are needed for the project to be financially feasible. Mr. Baum pointed out that by capitalizing on the south view, the units would be more marketable. In speaking with the State Preservation Office, Mr. Gunther concluded that the project would be more acceptable to the State if they were to make all the proposed double doors single doors.

The Board discussed the possibility of future development obstructing views they propose to create to the south. Mr. Baum responded that if the economics of the neighborhood improved enough to entice development on the parking lot site, there would not be an issue with occupancy. Additionally, Mr. Gunther commented that units could be combined and reoriented if necessary.

Ms. Sullebarger concluded that if the applicants modified their design of the windows in a way that would be approved by the State for the tax certification, the design would allow for the 106 Review determination of having No Adverse Effect and would ultimately save them time. The Board considered tabling the item for two weeks to allow the applicant time to modify the south elevation.

Mr. Senhauser expressed concern that the applicants are actually proposing to take a non-façade, which was most likely a party wall originally, and making it a primary façade. Mr. Raser added that he could accept the randomness of the windows given that the interior dictates their location and stated new openings could be justified in allowing for the next life of the building. Mr. Senhauser agreed that the question was not necessarily just the ratio of opening to solid wall; a certain amount is necessary to make the units viable. He stated that double doors might be appropriate given the size and nature of the building.

Ms. Borys commented that she had reservations about the balconies and that they not project from the building, but understood their necessity in complying with code. Additionally, she suggested that the architect consider each opening to eliminate

awkward relationships such as that between the easternmost fourth floor opening and the roof rake.

BOARD ACTION

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Borys, second by Clement) to take the following actions:

1. Find that the proposed size and number of new window openings on the south side elevation are inappropriate.
2. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the rehabilitation of the front and south side elevations with the condition that the number and size of the new openings on the south elevation be reduced and that final plans and specifications be reviewed by the Urban Conservator prior to issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness and a building permit.
3. Determine that the proposed rehabilitation may be made to meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and therefore constitute No Adverse Effect if the number and size of the proposed new window openings on the south elevation are reduced.
4. If the changes are not made to his satisfaction, direct the Urban Conservator to forward a Determination of Adverse Effect (with documentation) to the state historic office for resolution.

**SECTION 106 REVIEW, 1524-1528, 1540 MADISON ROAD,
MADISON/WOODBURN NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Staff member Cheri Rekow presented the staff report for a Section 106 Review on a four-story mixed-use development proposed for the northwest corner of Madison Road and Woodburn Avenue, which abuts the Madison/Woodburn National Register District. Adjacent to the project site is the St. Francis DeSales Church, an individually listed (and locally designated) National Register property, the A.M. Detmer House, listed on the National Register within the Samuel Hannaford Thematic Listing, and Elstun Flats, which has been identified as eligible for the National Register. The development would require the demolition of the DelMar apartment building, which is not eligible for the National Register, individually, or as part of a district.

Ms. Rekow explained that the City is contributing \$1.72 million toward the project, which includes federal funds. The use of federal funds necessitates the Section 106 Review whereby a determination must be made that the new construction has No Adverse Effect on the surrounding historic resources.

Ms. Rekow described the project and concluded that the proposed design is compatible with the surrounding resources and meets the applicable Secretary of Interior's Standards for new construction so as to constitute No Adverse Effect. She added that the loss of the DelMar apartment building is unfortunate, and that staff recommended that it be photo documented prior to its demolition.

The Board questioned the year the DelMar apartment building was constructed. Mr. Forwood estimated that it was circa 1900. In response to Ms. Wallace, Mr. Carlton Maddox from the Department of Community Development stated that the apartment building has been vacant for over six months and that the tenants were assisted in relocating.

In response to Mr. Senhauser, Mr. Maddox explained that the existing series of single story storefronts along Madison Road would remain, having sold this past year to a separate owner. The development will wrap around these storefronts with a parking garage attaching the plaza building with the west building. Mr. Senhauser pointed out that with the development not encompassing the entire block, its success might depend on the viability of the unrelated stores. Ms. Sullebarger pointed out that the parking might improve the probability of the stores remaining occupied. Mr. Maddox added that with the announcement of this project, an additional 121 additional residential housing units have been proposed, 700 jobs have been retained which were to be relocated, and additional retail investments are being considered.

BOARD ACTION

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Raser, second by Sullebarger) to take the following actions:

1. Find that the proposed DeSales Plaza project to be constructed on the northwest corner of Madison Road and Woodburn Avenue meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards.
2. Find that the proposed DeSales Plaza project will have No Adverse Effect on the adjacent historic resources.
3. Find that the DelMar apartment building at 2845-47 Woodburn Avenue is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and that its demolition will have No Effect on an historic resource.
4. Recommend that the DelMar apartment building at 2845-47 Woodburn Avenue be photo documented prior to its demolition.

ADJOURNMENT

As there were no other items for consideration by the Board, the meeting adjourned.

William L. Forwood
Urban Conservator

John C. Senhauser
Chairman

Date